



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,825	09/30/2003	Reiner Hammerich	09700.0046-00	3059
60668 7590 06/18/2008 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
DAO, THUY CHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,825

Applicant(s)

HAMMERICH ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11, 12 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11, 12 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 4, 2008.
2. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21-25 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. In the instant amendments, claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended; claims 4 and 14 have been canceled; and claim 25 has been added.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 24 (depending on claim 23) is objected to because of minor informalities. In the instant amendment, the Applicants added similar limitations recited in claim 24 to claim 23, and thus, make limitations recited in claim 24 appear redundant.

For the compact prosecution, claim 24 has been examined as presented.

Appropriate correction is requested in the next communication with the Office.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2192

7. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2004/0015840 A1 to Walker (art made of record, hereafter "Walker").

Claim 1:

Walker discloses *a method for validating programs, the method comprising:*
receiving a meta-language description of a computer program (e.g., [0022], XML representation of a Java class BookStore),
the meta-language description comprising a implementation module, the implementation module defining a first class to be implemented by the program (e.g., [0023] and [0021], XML description of class BookStore of a Java "book store" application) and
and an definition module, the definition module defining a first interface associated with the class (e.g., FIG. 4, block 410 → block 415 "Determine if XmlReaderWriter Interface Implemented?" → block 420 "Implemented"/YES: in said XML representation, said class BookStore associated with interface XmlReaderWriter);
validating the meta-language description (e.g., FIG. 5, block 505 → block 555 "Last XML Element? NO" → block 560 "Get Next XML Element", [0117]);
generating a language-dependent program from the meta-language description (e.g., FIG. 5, blocks 510, 540, and 550, [0112]-[0116]),
the language-dependent program comprising the first interface and the first class (e.g., [0024], [0038], [0086], Java class BookStore implementing the interface XmlReaderWriter); and
performing usage and semantic checks by compiling the generated first interface and the generated first class (e.g., [0021]-[0024], compiling said class and interface to obtain the executable of said Java "book store" application).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Walker discloses *validating the meta-language description comprises validating the syntax of the definition module and the*

implementation module (e.g., FIG. 5, block 505 → block 555 "Last XML Element? NO" → block 560 "Get Next XML Element", [0117]).

Claims 11-12:

Claims 11-12 recite the same limitations as those of claims 1-2, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 11-12.

Claim 21:

Claim 21 recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of claim 21.

Claim 22:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Walker discloses *the language-dependent program comprises a script code section written in a scripting language* (e.g., [0002]-[0003]).

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated. Walker discloses:
generating a compiler language representation of the script code section, the compiler language representation of the script code section comprising a second interface and a second class (e.g., [0061], [0069]); and
performing a semantics check of the script code section by compiling the second interface and the second class (e.g., [0070]-[0071]).

Claim 24:

The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated. Walker discloses *performing usage and semantic checks by compiling the generated second interface and the generated second class* (e.g., [0072]-[0087]).

Claim 25 (new):

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated. Walker discloses:
performing a usage check on the script code section by: extracting language elements from the script code section (e.g., [0071]-[0083]); *and comparing the extracted language elements with the meta-language definition module* (e.g., [0070] and [0084]-[0093]).

Conclusion

7. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

Art Unit: 2192

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192